

REMARKS

The present Response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised in the Interview Summary dated 7 March 2008 and the Advisory Action dated 20 March 2008. The present Response is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4-5, 13 and 15 are pending in the application.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for drafting an interview summary on 7 March 2008. Applicants would like to clarify the last sentence in the interview summary, namely, “At the end of the interview, the Applicant ask for the Examiner’s advice to amend the claim so that it overcome the current applied arts.” Applicants disagree.

Applicants asked the Examiner for a replacement term for “substantially” that the Examiner would find agreeable, and not overly broad. Applicants did not ask for Examiner’s advice to amend the claims so that the claims overcome the prior art. It is, and has been Applicants position that the claims already avoid the prior art, and further claim amendments are unnecessary.

Advisory Action

The Advisory Action stated that the newly amended portion of claims raises new matter because:

paragraph 20 of the pending Specification disclose the composition of said impure copper seed is slightly different with the material composition of said impure copper fill. But there is no support in the pending

specification mention about the composition of the impure copper seed layer is the same as the impure copper fill layer.

Applicants disagree. The claim amendments in the Response dated 29 February 2008 were responsive to the Examiner's objection of the term "substantially" as overly broad, despite the fact that MPEP §2173.05(b) discusses the definiteness of such term. Moreover, the claim amendments do not state that the impure copper seed layer is the same as the impure copper fill layer. The entire limitation states:

said impure copper seed layer is the same as material composition of said impure copper fill except some impurities in the impure copper fill are absent from the impure copper seed layer as a consequence of deposition of the impure copper seed layer

Therefore, the impure copper seed layer and the impure copper fill have differences, and those difference are evident by some impurities in the fill being absent in the seed layer. Such claim limitations have always been present in the pending application. Such claim limitations can be found, for example, at ¶20 and ¶24 of the specification as originally filed. For at least these reasons, the new matter assertion should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if there is any such fee due, please charge any such fee to the deposit account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa U. Jaklitsch/

Lisa U. Jaklitsch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,168

Dated: April 29, 2008

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
Intellectual Property Law Department, East Fishkill
2070 Route 52, Bldg-321, Zip-482
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533
Tel: (845) 894-8469
Fax: (845) 892-6363